REMARKS

The application contains claims 1-3, 7-18, 20 and 22-26. By this amendment, claims 4-6, 19 and 21 are canceled and claims 22-26 are new. Support for new claims 22-26 can be found, for example, on page 14, lines 7-25 and Figure 7. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-3, 7-18, 20 and 22-26 Define over Kuznetsov and Coulthard et al.

Claims 1-3, 7-18, 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Kuznetsov (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0056504) in view of Coulthard et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0003013). Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections because neither Kuznetsov nor Coulthard et al., either alone or in combination, teach or suggest all elements of independent claims 1, 15 or 20.

The features of claims 4-6 have been incorporated into claim 1. Amended claim 1 now recites:

> A method, comprising:
> (a) creating in a design environment a file that determines a metadata that relates at least one business object and at least one query;
> (b) communicating the file to a mobile device;
> (c) storing the file on the mobile device;
> (d) transforming the file into a binary structure at an initial run of a computer application running on the mobile device, the binary structure adapted to be read by the computer application; and
> (e) recording the binary structure in a memory of the mobile device, wherein the method further comprises:
> **storing a datestamp and a filesize in the memory with the binary structure**, the datestamp and the filesize uniquely identifying the file corresponding to the binary structure;
> **determining whether the file has been updated upon a startup of the computer application by comparing a further datestamp and a further filesize of a further file stored on the mobile device to the datestamp and the filesize**, respectively, recorded with the binary structure; and
> **mapping the binary structure by the computer application from the memory if the file has not been updated.**

An aspect of the present invention provides a mobile device application with access to a database. In particular, features of the present invention, as recited in claim 1, enable a mobile device to effectively manage updated versions of files it receives. Specifically, claim 1 recites that a "datestamp and a filesize [of a received file are stored] in the memory [of the mobile device]" and are compared to a further stored datestamp and filesize of a further received file to determine "whether the file has been updated upon a startup of the computer application." Based on this determination step, the binary structure of the file is mapped "if the file has not been updated [(i.e., if the further stored file is not an updated version of the current stored file)]." These features are neither taught nor suggested by Kuznetsov or Coulthard et al.

The Office Action alleges that Kuznetsov, at paragraph 40, discloses "determining whether the file has been updated upon a startup of the computer application" as recited in claim 1. Applicant disagrees as paragraph 40 of Kuznetsov is directed to a translator that "translates the data as it arrives from any typical source" and so clearly does not disclose the step of determining whether a received file has been updated. Furthermore, Kuznetsov does not disclose determining whether a received file has been updated by "comparing a further datestamp and a further filesize of a further file stored on the mobile device to the datestamp and the filesize" as recited in claim 1. The Office Action alleges that Coulthard et al., at paragraph 12, discloses "storing a datestamp and a filesize in the memory with the binary structure" and "comparing a further datestamp and a further filesize of a further file stored on the mobile device to the datestamp and the filesize" as recited in claim 1. Applicants disagree as paragraph 12 of Coulthard et al. is limited to the following:

> File dates are nonessential metadata; there are many dates to associate with a file: creation date, date of last data modification, date of last metadata modification, date of last data access, etc. Modification date is immutable metadata.

Clearly Coulthard et al. is limited to disclosing file dates can be metadata. Neither this section of Coulthard et al. nor any other portion of Coulthard et al. teaches or suggests "storing a datestamp and a filesize [of a file] in the memory [of a mobile device] with the binary structure of the file]", "determining whether the file has been updated upon a startup of the computer application by comparing a further datestamp and a further filesize of a further file stored on the mobile device to the datestamp and the filesize," or conditioning the "mapping [of] the binary structure by the computer application from the memory" on the results of the determining step, as clearly recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of

claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn as <u>Kuznetsov</u> and <u>Coulthard et al.</u>, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above discussed features of claim 1.

Claims 7-14 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons applicable to claim 1, as well as due to the features recited therein.

Independent claims 15 and 20 recite limitations similar to those of claim 1 and are therefore allowable over <u>Kuznetsov</u> nor <u>Coulthard et al.</u> for at least those reasons mentioned above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 16-17, 22-23 and 24-25 are allowable for at least those reasons stated above and based on their dependency on independent claims 15 and 20, respectively.

New claim 26 is allowable for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicant notes that claim 26 closely follows Figure 7 of the present application which is neither taught or suggested by <u>Kuznetsov</u> or <u>Coulthard et al.</u>

663767v2

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendments and favorable action in connection with this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 to Kenyon & Kenyon Deposit Account No. 11-0600. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4419 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

All claims are allowable. Allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: June 25, 2007   /Wesley W. Jones/
Wesley W. Jones
Reg. No. 56,552

Kenyon & Kenyon LLP
1500 K Street, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 220-4200
Fax: (202) 220-4201

663767v2